

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite, because claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 recite the phrase, "computing a ground path that an aircraft would follow if a turn at the maximum rate." In response, claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 have been amended to clarify that the method comprises "computing a feeler line ground path, wherein the feeler line ground path is a ground path that an aircraft would follow if a turn at the maximum rate applicable to the current flight phase of the aircraft were to begin at that instant". Support for such amendment can be found on page 3, lines 19-23 of the specification as originally filed.

It should now be clear from the wording of the claims that the computation of the feeler line ground path is not dependent upon the turn at the maximum rate actually occurring, but the computed feeler line ground path is the path that would be followed if such a turn occurred.

Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the method comprises displaying both the feeler line ground path and a ground path to be captured. Accordingly, the language of claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 are definite and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knoll (US 20020010530A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons as below.

Knoll (US 2002/0010530) describes an aircraft flight display that displays the approach to a destination, the approach comprising a section 15 to the side of a runway, an arced section 16, and a final approach 17. The displayed approach 14, 15, 16 is shown in Figure 1 of Knoll.

The approach 15, 16, 17 of Knoll et al seems to be a ground path, which is similar to the ground path to be captured as recited in Claim 1 of the present application (see page 1, paragraph 2 of the present application).

Claim 1 recites that both a feeler line ground path and a ground path to be captured are displayed on a navigation screen. For instance, according to one of the embodiment of the present invention, Figure 4 illustrates that both a feeler line ground path (6A or 6B) and a ground path to be captured 1 are displayed in the same screen.

By displaying both a feeler line ground path and a ground path to be captured, the claimed invention provides an efficient way of taking into account the effects of the wind, and enables the capturing of the path to be optimized.

In contrast, Knoll clearly teaches the display of only a single ground path representing the approach, as shown in Figure 1. Nowhere does Knoll teach or suggest displaying two ground paths (the feeler line ground path and the ground path to be captured) as recited in claim 1.

Based on the above reasons, Knoll fails to disclose computing a feeler line ground path and displaying on a navigation screen both the feeler line ground path and a ground path to be captured. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that it beyond the skill of a hypothetical ordinary person in the art to compute a feeler line ground path at the maximum rate applicable to the flight and taking into account of the wind speed. As discloses in page 2, line 19 to page 3, line 12, it is particularly explained that the difficulty of the existing navigation system to capture the ground path and to overcome the offset of wind. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Knoll and the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 14 and 15 include similar limitations as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claims 6, 14 and 15 should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits, and the rejection of claims 6, 14 and 15 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 are dependent from claims 1 and 6. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 7-13 should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 19, 2008
KMB/SY/ser/cac